3

LETTERS

FROM

THE PRESIDENT

OF THE

Roman Catholic School Commissioners,

OF THE

City of Montreal,

IN ANSWER TO THE

ATTACKS made by THE EVENING POST

AND BY

LE MONDE.

86

1882
(66)

O.F.M. QUEBEC

114592

To the Editor of the EVENING POST :

SIR,—I am instructed by the Board of Roman Catholic School Commissioners of this city to request the publication in your paper of the following resolution, passed unanimously at their first meeting, after the publication in your columns of certain strictures upon its administration.

A. D. DECELLES,
Sec. C. S. C.

MONTREAL, December 10th, 1879.

At a meeting of the Roman Catholic School Commissioners, held on the 9th day of December instant, Reverend V. Rousselot, President of the Commission, in the chair, the following resolution was placed before the Board and unanimously carried :—

" Inasmuch as certain unfounded accusations have been brought against the administration of the Board of Roman Catholic School Commissioners, by individuals whose motives the Commission is not now called upon to appreciate ;

" Inasmuch as these accusations were embodied under twelve differen heads in a petition presented by certain citizens to the City Council a year or so ago ;

" Inasmuch as upon the presentation of this petition the Board of Roman Catholic School Commissioners, through the medium of the press, expressed to the public generally its willingness to court an enquiry from the only authority to which it is responsible, viz. the Department of Public Instruction ;

" Inasmuch as such offer has never been acted upon by the petitioners to the City Council ; and

" Inasmuch as similar charges have recently been reiterated in one of the evening newspapers of this city ; be it

" *Resolved*,—That this Board having ever been willing and desirous that those interested in the upright and judicious administration of its trust should have every opportunity given them to formulate any charges of mismanagement alleged against this commission, publicity be once more given of its willingness and desire that an *enquête* into its administration be demanded by those who, for motives of public or private interest, are prepared to substantiate their accusations."

To the Editor of the EVENING POST :

I notice with regret that in your edition of yesterday you persist in your accusations against the gentlemen of the Roman Catholic School Commission of this city, supplemented by an assertion that, as matters stand at present, the " onus " is upon us to establish the good administration of the Commission.

This pretension is subversive of the most elementary principles of justice, which presume every man innocent until proved guilty. You publish against myself, as against the other members of the Commission, charges of the most serious nature, of which I feel guiltless, and you request an *enquête*.

I cheerfully accept your proposal. Let responsible men clearly formulate their charges before the Government, and demand an investigation. I assure you that I court it as much as you do.

Before closing, allow me to say that I sincerely regret that, before attacking us publicly as you have done, you did not obtain from us exact information; we would have given it, and you would have thus avoided serious error, as you may judge for yourself by referring to the answers appended to this letter, and you would not have written articles, as a Catholic and a man of honor, you must now regret.

V. Rousselot, Priest,
President, Catholic School Commissioners.

December 12th, 1879.

---

1. Editorial of November 12th, 1879:

"The Provincial Government appoints seven Commissioners, and the "City Council appoints two; so that not one of them is appointed by the "people who pay the taxes."

The Commission numbers only six members—two clergymen and four laymen. Three only are named by the Local Government, and the three others are elected by the people's representatives in the City Council.

2. Editorial under same date:

"As regards the former ('the Commercial Academy on St. Catherine "street'), we cannot precisely state, but may put it down at the princely "sum of half a million of dollars."

The nine large school buildings erected by the Commissioners cost in all $318,000. The cost of the Plateau Academy, included in this sum, amounts to $84,279, comprising the Principal's residence.

3. Editorial November 19th, 1879:

"Then again, after a diligent search, we can only obtain three annual "reports furnished by the Commissioners, during their reign of ten years, to "the City Council."

According to law, the annual reports since 1871, have been regularly published yearly, in French and English newspapers in this city. This report of all the receipts and expenses of the Commission has been regularly sent every twelvemonth to the Minister of Public Instruction, to be published in the *Journal of Education*. Although not obligatory, copies of these reports have been transmitted to the City Council.

4. Editorial. November 22nd, 1879:—

"A school in Roy street, at an enormous expense—a school entirely un-"necessary, and which is now mostly attended by the children of St. Jean "Baptiste Village."

There are in Roy street school, as shown by the last returns, 315 pupils, only 13 of which number are residents beyond the city limits, and the latter pay double fees.

5. Editorial, November 29th, 1879.

"The Catholic School Commissioners could not get along with the "million of money or so they have received up to this, not to mention the "three or four hundred thousand dollars annually paid by the pupils in fees.'

The total amount of fees paid for the last fiscal year, by all the pupils in every school or academy under the Commission, was $15,737.36, and included in this sum are $7.408,61 paid by students who attend the schools, which, though under the control of the Commission and subsidized by it, collect their own fees for their maintenance. The Commission, therefore, only receives $8,328.75

6. Editorial, November 29th, 1879:

"But, nevertheless, the children had to pay large fees, and it is a well "known fact that those who could not afford to pay them were excluded from "the schools."

Suffice it to say that of 7,113 scholars frequenting (as shown by last year's report) all the schools under the control of the Commission, 2,263 or 32 per cent, were admitted free of charge, and received their education gratuitously. The average annual fee per head upon the number who pay fees at all, viz: 4,850 scholars, is only $3.22 per annum.

7. Editorial, December 9th, 1879:

"What has happened the three or four hundred thousand dollars dis-"crepancy between the receipts and expenditures as shown by their meagre "returns."

A gratuitous and false assertion. The accounts have been regularly audited and balanced every year. No discrepancy whatever between the receipts and expenditures exists or is shown by the returns.

The *Evening Post* having refused to publish the following letter, it was inserted in the Montreal *Gazette* and *Evening Star*.

Montreal, 30th December, 1879.

To the Editor EVENING POST:

SIR,—I had trusted in sending you my letter of the 12th instant, that you would either have accepted my explanations or taken immediately the step you had yourself suggested of demanding an investigation by Government. I informed you of our desire, equal to your own, that it should be granted, and expressed even our happiness at your obtaining it, and yet you have taken no measures in that direction, but continued to launch against us accusations that I cannot but characterize as unworthy. In your editorial of the 15th inst., in the adjoining column to the one containing my letter in the same issue, you have cast a slur upon my position of President of the Board of Catholic School Commissioners of this city by confirming what you had already stated in allusion to me in your article of the 12th.

"It is not improbable the reverend gentleman was placed in that position in order that an air of respectability might be thrown over the proceed-

ings, for it is almost unnecessary to say that he knows very little about the operation of the active members of the Commission—what may be termed the inner circle."

Now, sir, this assertion on your part is in itself a personal accusation against myself as serious as it is gratuitous, and furthermore inculpates the other gentlemen of the Commission. It amounts simply to charging me with having accepted and occupied as a sinecure a position of public trust and responsibility, with having neglected my duty and closed my eyes to the administration of a board over whose important deliberations I have the honor to preside. It charges also the gentlemen composing the Commission with having deceived and blinded me in their operations. If you shrink from an *enquête* that would disclose the truth, at least I challenge you to prove these accusations.

I find also in your editorial of the 15th instant:

"The Government Blue Books for 1876 and 1877 show, for monthly fees, $334,880, and for the following year nearly $400,000."

You must know that the statements in the returns you refer to, and the figures they contain, represent the monthly revenue derived during the year from all the Catholic schools in the city of Montreal, comprising the fees received from all those Catholic institutions, such as the Montreal College, the St. Mary's College, the Oblats and Friar's Schools, the various convents and academies of the Sisters of the Congregation, the Sacred Heart, Bon Pasteur, St. Laurent, &c., and yet you would render us responsible for all this revenue! How can the Commissioners be called upon to answer or to be accountable for fees received by institutions over which they exercise no control whatever? You impose upon the good faith of your readers.

Further on in the same editorial you continue: "Granted that the school alone costs $84,000, what about the 200,000 feet of land surrounding it, the filling of it up, the marble posts, the grand St. Catherine street entrance and other expensive *et ceteras*, which must be taken into account as well as the building pure and simple."

You at first pretended that the Plateau Academy building had cost $500,000. It is pleasing to see you rectify your error: $416,000 is certainly not a trifling discrepancy.

As to the land the Commissioners acquired it at an average of 38½ cents a foot, but this, I am informed by the accountant and those who have familiarized themselves with details, includes grading, tracing of avenues, filling planting of trees and other improvements. This land is far more valuable to-day. A portion of this property which was not considered necessary by the Board was disposed of, five or six years after its purchase, at the rate of $1 a foot. The speculation, as I view it, was not such an unfortunate one. You will, moreovor, learn with satisfaction that all the material out of which are erected the marble posts at the St. Catherine street entrance of the Academy was the generous gift of an ex-alderman of this city. The lamps and other "expensive et ceteras" were donations from practical friends of Catholic institutions.

Further on you say :—

" That the Commissioners have rejected the tenders of men who offered " to do the work required at a cheaper rate than those accepted, and would " have done it after a better fashion." I fail to understand the tenders you refer to. As a matter of fact, whenever an important undertaking was to be commenced, coal purchased, &c., tenders were called for in the usual way—and at our board meetings, it is to our personal knowledge that we invariably give the contract to the lowest reliable tenderer. As regards the St. Bridget's Christian Brothers' School, you find means to base a charge that you can certainly not support or justify. This school does not belong to the Commission, it is parish property, over which we can exercise absolutely no control whatever. We have no power or authority to effect any change in the construction of the building.

The Commissioners give the Brothers who teach there an annual subsidy of $2,000. In what then does our guilt consist ?

In one of your colums you, moreover, assert that the primary school on the Plateau was built by the Commissioners, and for obvious reasons, *by day labor*. But, my dear sir, if my memory serves me right, Dr. Nelson erected this building as a dwelling house for himself and family. The Commissioners only purchased it years after its construction.

I might continue my quotations from your columns, refuting as easily *all* your accusations, but let me ask you before I close, what legitimate motive have you, a Catholic and editor of the only Catholic daily published in this city in the English tongue, in waging this war against us ? For my part I can conceive none.

If you are really acting in good faith, I urge it once more, request an *enquête*. If we are found guilty, you will then be right in publicly denouncing us, and in attacking us as we should deserve. But if indeed we are not guilty of all these charges you shower upon us, why resort to such means to fanaticise the public mind ? Is this conduct worthy of a Catholic Irishman ?

Believe me, sir, it is with regret that I see myself forced to address you this lengthy letter, but I felt it to be my duty both as priest, and as the Curé of Notre Dame. This, however, cannot alter my lasting affection for my Irish brethren and friends, and my desire to be of every service to them in my power.

Your humble servant,

V. ROUSSELOT, Priest,

President of the Catholic School Commission.

MONTREAL, January 2nd, 1880.

Editor EVENING POST :

I see by your issue of to-day that you decline to publish, not as you assert, "a Statement of the Commissioners" but *my own* letter sent you on the 30th ult. This refusal, I regret to say, is in keeping with the course you have

followed in your attacks upon the Commissioners. As a journalist, and I may go further, as a Catholic, you were bound in equity and by your own conscience to give to my refutation the same publicity that had characterized your charges against the board. You have deemed it *expedient* to act otherwise, and I have now no other course left me but to appeal to the columns of another journal in order that your readers may be disabused as regards our respective positions.

The bearer is instructed to request the return of my manuscript.

V. ROUSSELOT, Priest.

To the Editor of THE GAZETTE :

SIR,—Will you kindly insert the enclosed letter, which I originally sent to the *Post* for publication. The editors of that paper having, however, thought proper to suppress an important part of it, I have only now to request that you kindly give it space in your hospitable columns.

V. ROUSSELOT, Priest S. S.,
President.

Montreal, 13th February, 1882.

To the Editor of THE POST :

SIR, – In your letter of the 10th instant you accuse the Roman Catholic, School Commissioners of canvassing Mr. Donovan's election to the Council and of using for that purpose the funds derived from the school taxes.

The Commissioners having noticed the article, indignantly protest against these false and calumnious accusations, *in keeping with those* that the *Post* newspaper has already circulated against them.

(Signed), V. ROUSSELOT, P. S. S.,
President

Montreal, 11th February, 1882.

THE CATHOLIC SCHOOL COMMISSIONERS.

We find the following letter in yesterday's *Minerve* :—

To the Editor of the Minerve :

SIR,—In November and December, 1879, the *Post* made the most serious charges against the Catholic School Commissioners of Montreal. Two letters from the Chairman of the Board were sufficient to prove the utter groundlessness of these accusations, accusations unworthy of a man of honor.

Peace was soon restored. It was thought it would last. We were however, mistaken.

Since a few months the *Post* has recommenced its attacks, which are as devoid of fairness as ever, and what is more painful to us, a French Catholic newspaper has thought proper to follow suit and trump up charges which have just as little foundation in fact.

We shall now enumerate and answer a few of the most serious. We are reproached with not placing Brothers in all our schools.

The reverend Brothers must admit having declared on several occasions that they had not a single unemployed Brother. This declaration was quite recently reiterated to several *curés*, who desired to place under their control certain educational establishments ; they even stated that they could, if they had them, employ one hundred more Brothers.

If the Catholic School Commissioners are now asking for an increase of taxation, they are compelled to do so, chiefly for the purpose of maintaining new schools lately taken under their control, in the parishes of St. Joseph, St Ann's, &c., schools managed exclusively by Brothers and Nuns.

The charge of feeling nothing but contempt for the Friars is an atrocious calumny, which we consider beneath our notice. The religious orders are entitled to and can rely on our sympathy and assistance.

If the Brothers are not so well remunerated as the lay teachers, it is because, having made vows of povertv, they are satisfied with much less. Everyone understands that a Brother does not need so high a salary as a lay teacher, who as a family to support, and who, if he be not allowed what is fair and necessary, will be obliged to abandon the profession, and we would then have no one for our schools.

The editorial of *Le Monde* of the first of April states that but 4,702 children profit by the school-tax, and that the poor derive no benefit whatsoever therefrom. Our school reports for 1880–81 prove, 1st,—That more than 7,000 children attended our schools during that same year. Next year, this number will be increased by more than two thousand, on account of the new schools that we have just taken under our control. 2nd—That nearly twenty-five per cent of the pupils were admitted free, (24.78). 3rd—That nearly as many others were admitted at reduced rates, and 4th—That finally quite a number of those who had promised to pay have not done so.

But without losing any more time in refuting those charges, we will say a few words in defence of the policy which actuated the Commissioners, when founding the Plateau Academy, the Polytechnic and other schools.

Twelve years ago the Catholics of Montreal had not a single commercial school worthy of the name nor any school capable of preparing young men for the courses of land surveying, civil and mining engineering, &c. The young (French and Irish) Catholics desirous of qualifying for these professions were obliged to attend schools of a different creed. We now ask the public in all fairness, if this was not, for a city like Montreal, a want as deplorable as it was humiliating.

The Commissioners thought that the establishing of those two institutions on a footing which would leave no pretext for frequenting other schools, was not only a necessary work, but one for which they deserved the gratitude of their fellow-citizens. Were they wrong?

But why, it is added, build those other fine schools at Point St. Charles, on Guy, Fullum, Plessis streets? Why not put up cheaper buildings?

We acknowledge that were we commencing again, we would be satisfied with humbler and less expensive school houses. But from 1870 to 1875, Montreal enjoyed an era of prosperity which seemed to presage a brilliant future. The city was growing, and with it the value of property. The School Commissioners, like all other citizens, not only hoped that their revenue would not decrease, but that it would increase from year to year, and that they would feel no difficulty in meeting their obligations.

On the other hand, they knew and appreciated that principle of the Gospel a principle dear even to Pagan philosophers, that the greatest respect is due to the child, that the laborer's child as well as the child of the rich deserves all attention, that it is well to develop in it a taste for the good and beautiful, and to show the value of education.

Actuated by these sentiments and by national pride, the commissioners considered it but right that, since the Corporation were erecting fine buildings for the policemen and firemen (who, we are glad to acknowledge, are worthy of them,) it was only proper and fair to give equally fine buildings to the children of the city.

After taking everything into consideration they determined to erect those schools, which are now a credit to the city of Montreal and the Catholic population.

But in 1877 happened the commercial crisis which ruined so many. Alas! Who can forget it? Where are the citizens whose calculations were not upset, whose undertakings were not affected by it, and in a word where are those who came out of the fire unscathed?

The commission was not an exception, it suffered, its revenue was diminished by more than $20,000.

This will be easily understood: In 1875 the value of the real estate of the city, upon which the school tax is levied, was estimated at $79,258,565;

in 1880, at $64,514,401, a decrease of $14,744,164. These figures were furnished us by the City Treasurer.

This is why the Catholic as well as the Protestant School Commissioners have for the last few years been unable to make both ends meet, notwithstanding a reduction of 10 per cent, taken off the salaries of all their employés. This is also why they are compelled to apply to the Legislature. If the Government does not assist and grant them for ten years the increase asked for, they do not see how it is possible to continue the work of education.

In conclusion, we leave the facts, which are simply the naked truth, to the appreciation of the public.

But we ask those persons who attack us in *Le Monde* and the *Post* to do so openly; let them sign their articles, and if they be responsible and honest, let them ask the Government for an investigation. The public will then be in a position to judge us. If we are guilty we shall accept the condemnation without a murmur.

V. Rousselot, Priest,
President Catholic School Commissioners of Montreal.

Montreal, 24th April, 1882.

25th April, 1882.

P. S. — As we were finishing this letter yesterday evening the City Council held a meeting and rejected by a vote of 16 to 10 the report of the Finance Committee, recommending an increase of the school tax. We cannot accept the action of the Council as a final decision of the question. If funds are necessary for the education of the city children we cannot admit the right of the Council to refuse them, thus depriving thousands of children of education and condemning them to a life on the streets. This would be more than a disgrace; it would be a calamity for the city.

It is a well known fact that of all the cities in America Montreal is the one that pays the smallest tax for the maintenance of the schools.

Mr. J. Grenier, one of the worthy Catholic Commissioners, seeing that, notwithstanding all his efforts, his motion was rejected, has tendered his resignation as Commissioner. We hope that the Corporation shall not see fit to accept it. V. R.

These letters, signed by Mr. Rousselot, have been written in the name of the Roman Catholic Board of School Commissioners, of which he is the President, and with their unanimous approbation.

But in view of the fact that even since the publication of the last letter, *Le Monde* persists in accusing the Catholic Commissioners of refusing to publish the annual report of their financial administration, the said Board now asks the editors of this paper how, in good faith, they can make such an accusation, when they are well aware of the following facts :—

1. That this printed statement for 1880-81 was laid on the desk of every Alderman in the City Council, on the 23rd January last.

2. That three newspapers of this city published it, two of them on the 25th and the other on the 26th January.

These papers, in publishing the same, made the following remarks :—

Star, 25*th January*, 1882.—" The annual financial statement of the Roman " Catholic School Commissioners has been put in the hands of the City Clerk " for presentation to Council. The following are the principal figures," &c.

Post, 25*th January*, 1882.—" The annual financial statement of the Roman " Catholic Board of School Commissioners for the scholastic year ending " June, 1881, was presented to the City Council on Monday afternoon, from " which we take the following figures," &c.

Gazette, 26*th January*, 1882.—" The following statement of the receipts " and expenditure of the Roman Catholic Board of School Commissioners will " be laid before the City Council at its next meeting."

3. That the said Board of Commissioners has no objection to have it printed again in full, and to place it before the public, as shown below.

4. Finally, that if this report was not published in the columns of *Le Monde*, it is because that paper preferred not to publish it.

A fact that shows that the editor of *Le Monde* has seen these financial statements is, that he has taken from them the figures which he gives in his articles.

FINANCIAL REPORT OF THE

ROMAN CATHOLIC SCHOOL COMMISSIONERS

OF THE CITY OF MONTREAL,

To the Honorable Superintendent of Public Instruction for the Province of Quebec,

FOR THE SCHOLASTIC YEAR 1880-81.

STATEMENT of the General Receipts and Expenditures from July 1st 1880, till June 30th 1881, inclusively.

RECEIPTS.

	$ cts.	$ cts.
Cash on hand July 1st, 1880		14,284 20
Received from the City of Montreal, School Tax for 1880	62,906 05	
Less amount received in advance	22,760 92	40,145 13
Received from the Superintendent of Public Instruction, annual grant for Common Schools	10,127 54	
do from the same, account grant for the Polytechnic School	3,000 00	
do from the same, Superior Education fund	1,995 00	15,122 54
do from the Seminary, for surveying made by the pupils of the Polytechnic School		200 00
do fees from the pupils		9,766 67
do amount deducted from the salaries and grants, for the pension fund		893 14
do rent of houses		456 09
do on notes discounted		30,000 00
do for books, &c		55 65
		110,923 42

EXPENDITURE.

		$ cts.
Paid for the maintenance of Schools. (See Schedule A)		51,846 64
do for the purchase of instruments, books, &c., and for the support of the Polytechnic School. (See Schedule C)		5,918 80
do for furniture for Schools		606 32
do for books for libraries of different schools		483 77
do for improvements to real estate, repairs, &c		3.588 79
do expenses of administration		3,194 67
do Superintendent's office, salary and other expenses		1,886 96
do interest on notes and mortgages		9,032 21
do do on debentures		21,300 00
do Sinking fund on debentures		7,734 91
do amount deducted by the Superintendent of Public Instruction, from the annual grant in favor of Common Schools, for the pension fund		893 14
Cash on hand June 30th, 1881		4,437 21
		110,923 42

SCHEDULE A.

STATEMENT of the payments made for the maintenance of Schools.

NAMES OF SCHOOLS.	Salaries and grants.	Care-taking.	Prizes.	Books and Sta-tion'ry	Print-ing.	Fuel.	Light.	Taxes.	General expense	Totals.
	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts	$ cts.	$ cts.
1. Plateau Commercial Academy	10551 75	511 51	147 76	32 87	80 00	349 42	114 25	1100 00	628 01	13515 57
2. Montcalm School	5178 07	297 84	59 30	6 70	.....	80 35	19 30	127 25	28 64	5797 45
3. Champlain "	4683 00	391 05	53 05	14 13	.....	226 36	38 40	223 90	79 44	5709 33
4. Sarsfield "	3010 01	330 37	49 50	3 97	.....	237 73	34 60	157 56	68 39	3892 13
5. Belmont "	4923 97	511 39	54 48	13 20	4 50	273 50	40 40	332 67	222 38	6376 49
6. Olier "	4489 23	398 55	52 10	3 31	6 00	208 02	41 40	270 91	157 19	5626 71
7. Plessis "	1400 00	.....	50 00	.....	.....	294 25	.....	287 69	90 50	2122 44
8. St. Bridget "	1700 00	.....	17 35	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	1 50	1718 85
9. School 256 Notre Dame street	152 00	.....	5 50	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	157 50
10. " Mullins street	720 00	.....	10 15	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	730 15
11. " St. Catherine street	720 00	.....	10 90	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	730 90
12. " Corner Maisonneuve and Ontario	720 00	.....	28 30	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	748 30
13. " " Visitation and Craig	475 00	.....	27 60	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	502 60
14. " " Mignonne and St. Denis	285 00	.....	3 40	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	288 40
15. " for the Blind	380 00	.....	2 40	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	382 40
16. " 7 St. Elizabeth	680 00	.....	11 95	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	8 33	700 28
17. " 165 St. Elizabeth	189 97	.....	2 35	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	192 32
18. " 526 St. Mary	288 74	.....	5 15	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	50	294 39
19. " 39 St. Antoine	379 94	.....	4 70	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	384 64
20. " Corner Cadieux and Roy	285 00	.....	8 60	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	293 60
21. " 312 Logan	379 94	.....	5 10	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	385 04
22. " 250 Panet	237 45	.....	2 45	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	239 90
23. " 474 St. Catherine	285 00	.....	2 40	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	50	287 90
24. " 199 Canning	380 00	.....	8 50	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	388 50
25. " 624 St. Catherine	248 00	.....	5 85	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	1 00	254 85
26. Evening School	126 00	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	126 00
	42868 07	2440 71	628 84	74 18	90 50	1669 63	288 35	2499 98	1286 38	51846 64

SCHEDULE B.

TABLE showing the net expenses for the maintenance of each School.

NAMES OF SCHOOLS.	General Expenses.			Special Receipts.			Net expenses	No. of pupils.	Net cost per pupil per annum
	Salaries and grants.	Other expenses	Total expenses	Government grant.	School fees.	Total receipts.			
	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.		$ cts.
1. Plateau Commercial Academy	10551 75	2963 82	13515 57	1995 00	5173 81	7168 81	6346 76	336	18 91
2. Montcalm School	5178 07	619 38	5797 45		1331 55	1331 55	4465 90	370	12 07
3. Champlain do	4683 00	1026 33	5709 33		319 89	319 89	5389 44	374	14 41
4. Sarsfield do	3010 01	882 12	3892 13		433 45	433 45	3458 68	273	12 66
5. Belmont do	4923 97	1452 52	6376 49		1124 57	1124 57	5251 92	375	14 05
6. Olier do	4489 23	1137 48	5626 71		963 89	963 89	4662 82	387	12 05
7. Plessis do	1400 00	722 44	2122 44				2122 44	338	6 27
8. St. Bridget do	1700 00	18 85	1718 85				1718 85	473	3 63
9. School 256 Notre Dame street	152 00	5 50	157 50				157 50	163	96
10. do Mullins street	720 00	10 15	730 15				730 15	281	2 60
11. do St. Catherine	720 00	10 90	730 90				730 90	301	2 43
12. do cor. Maisonneuve and Ontario sts	720 00	28 30	748 30				748 30	704	1 06
13. do " Visitation and Craig "	475 00	27 60	502 60				502 60	743	67
14 do " Mignonne and St. Denis "	285 00	3 40	288 40				288 40	109	2 65
15. do for the Blind	380 00	2 40	382 40				382 40	34	11 25
16. do 7 St. Elizabeth street	680 00	20 28	700 28				700 28	341	2 05
17. do 165 " "	189 97	2 35	192 32				192 32	78	2 47
18. do 526 St. Mary "	288 74	5 65	294 39				294 39	154	1 91
19. do 39 St. Antoine "	379 94	4 70	384 64				384 64	138	2 79
20. do cor. Cadieux and Roy streets	285 00	8 60	293 60				293 60	223	1 31
21. do 312 Logan street	379 94	5 10	385 04				385 04	161	2 40
22. do 250 Panet "	237 45	2 45	239 90				239 90	96	2 50
23. do 474 St. Catherine street	285 00	2 90	287 90				287 90	87	3 31
24. do 199 Canning "	380 00	8 50	388 50				388 50	267	1 45
25. do 624 St. Catherine "	248 00	6 85	254 85				254 85	187	1 36
26. Evening School	126 00		126 00		78 50	78 50	47 50	12	3 96
	42868 07	8978 57	51846 64	1995 00	9425 66	11420 66	40425 98	7005	

SCHEDULE C.

PAYMENTS made for the maintenance of the Polytechnic School.

	$ cts.	$ cts.
Salaries of Professors		940 04
Expenses		
Repairs	28 87	
Printing	13 15	
Insurance	65 00	
Light	106 43	
Taxes	65 00	
Caretaking	221 30	
Heating	314 69	
	183 24	997 68
Drawing Instruments		6 73
Library		874 46
Stationery		6 65
Ornithological Collection		3 50
Physical instruments		2 70
Chemical laboratory		87 04
		5918 80
CREDIT.		
Received from the Government on account of grant ($4000)	3000 00	
" " pupils	341 01	
" " Seminary	200 00	3541 01
Amount paid by the Commissioners for the maintenance of the Polytechnic School		2377 79

SCHEDULE D.

TABLE showing the number of Professors and Pupils for each School.

	NAMES OF SCHOOLS.	Number of Professors.	Number of Pupils.	SEX.
1	Plateau Commercial Academy	12	336	Boys.
2	Montcalm School	6	370	do
3	Champlain "	6	374	do
4	Sarsfield "	4	273	do
5	Belmont "	6	375	do
6	Olier "	6	387	do
7	Plessis "	6	338	do
8	St. Bridget "	8	473	do
9	School 256 Notre Dame Street	8	163	Girls.
10	" Mullins Street	5	281	do
11	" St. Catherine Street	6	301	do
12	" corner Maissonneuve and Ontario Streets	11	704	do
13	" cor. Visitation and Craig Streets	12	743	do
14	" cor. Mignonne and St. Denis Sts	3	109	do
15	" for the Blind	7	34	Boys and Girls.
16	" 7 St. Elizabeth Street	9	341	do
17	" 165 " "	2	78	do
18	" 526 St. Mary "	3	154	do
19	" 39 St. Antoine "	4	138	do
20	" corner Cadieux and Roy Streets	5	223	Girls.
21	" 312 Logan Street	2	161	Boys and Girls.
22	" 250 Panet "	2	96	do
23	" 474 St. Catherine Street	2	87	do
24	" 199 Canning "	5	267	do
25	" 624 St. Catherine "	3	187	do
26	Evening School	1	12	Young Men.
		144	7005	

I hereby certify that I have examined the books kept by the Roman Catholic School Commissioners of the City of Montreal, and I declare that all the entries contained in the foregoing financial report are taken from the said books (which books I have compared together and found correct.)

I have also carefully compared and examined in detail all the said entries of moneys paid, with the vouchers in support thereof, and I have found the whole correct.

ED. FOURNIER,
Auditor.

MONTREAL, 31st October, 1881.